

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are indefinite under the provisions of 35 USC §112 second paragraph or anticipated under the provisions of 35 USC § 102(b). Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, Applicants request that the Examiner telephone Ms. Janet M. Skafar, Esq. at message telephone number (650) 988-0655 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

The Objections to the Specification

The disclosure is objected to because in paragraph [00037], lines 10, 16, related application numbers are blanks. In response, the Applicants have amended paragraph [00037] to fill in the related application number.

The disclosure is objected to because in paragraph [00042] lines 1-2, because “step 130” should be changed to “step 132”. In response, Applicants have amended the paragraph [00042] to change “step 130” to “step 132”.

Docket No.: SVL920030141US1
Appl. No.: 10/824,856
Amdt. dated January 16, 2007
Reply to Office Action of October 16, 2006

The Objection to Claims 15 and 16

Claims 15 and 16 are objected to as duplicated claims. In response Applicants have amended Claim 15 to depend from Claim 14, and have amended Claim 16 to depend from Claim 9.

The Rejection of Claims 15 and 16 Under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention.

In response, Applicants have amended Claim 15 to depend from Claim 14, and have amended Claim 16 to depend from Claim 9. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Rejection of the Claims Under 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 102 (b) as being anticipated by the Osborn et al. patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,791), hereinafter referred to as Osborn. Claims 1-20 have been amended to more particularly point out the invention.

Applicants have amended independent Claim 1 to more particularly point out the invention. Applicants respectfully maintain that Osborn does not teach, explicitly or implicitly, each and every element as claimed. Claim 1 recites: A method of collecting statistics in a database management system comprising a plurality of collection objects, at least one collection object of the plurality of collection objects comprising at least one table, comprising: receiving a workload comprising a plurality of database queries; identifying query statistics for the database queries; consolidating the query statistics for

the database queries to provide consolidated statistics; and generating at least one statistics collection task based on the consolidated statistics.

The rejection asserts that the summary table of Osborn is a collection object of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully maintain that the summary table of Osborn is different from the collection object of the claimed invention. Claim 1 recites: a plurality of collection objects, at least one collection object of the plurality of collection objects comprising at least one table. The summary table of Osborn is a table, not a collection object comprising at least one table.

The rejection asserts that the generating of summary table creation recommendations of Osborn is the same as generating at least one statistics collection task. Applicants respectfully maintain that the summary table creation recommendation of Osborn is different from the at least one statistics collection task of the claimed invention.

In column 1, lines 24-34, Osborn teaches that users often issue queries which require aggregation of data from large tables and/or which require aggregation of data from two or more tables. Responding to such queries can be time consuming. As a result, it is not uncommon for a database to include one or more summary tables, which contain selected subsets of data items, and/or aggregations of data items from one or more tables. A particular advantage of summary tables is that they contain pre-generated values, which allow the DBMS to more quickly access and retrieve queried data.

The term “statistics collection task” refers to a task to collect statistics. The summary table creation recommendation of Osborn is to create a summary table containing aggregated data, not to collect statistics.

Furthermore, even assuming that a summary table is a collection object, following that assumption, the generating of summary table creation recommendations of Osborn would teach the generating of collection object creation recommendations. In contrast, the claimed invention has the recitation of generating at least one statistics collection task. The claimed invention does not generate collection object creation recommendations.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully maintain that Osborn does not teach, explicitly or implicitly, all the recitations of Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully maintain that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Osborn and is patentable.

Claims 2-8 depend, either directly or indirectly from Claim 1, and are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 1.

Claims 9 and 17 have similar distinguishing recitations as Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully maintain the Claims 9 and 17 are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 1.

Claims 10-16 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 9 and are patentable for the same reasons as Claims 9. Claims 18-20 depend from Claim 17, and are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 18.

Claims 2, 10 and 18

Claims 2, 10 and 18 have been amended to more particularly point out the invention. Claim 2 recites that the at least one statistics collection task is to collect database statistics associated with the at least one table of the at least one collection object of the plurality of collection objects.

In contrast, Osborn generates summary table creation recommendations for summary tables. Osborn does not disclose generating at least one statistics collection task **to collect database statistics** associated with the at least one table of the at least one collection object based on the consolidated statistics.

For the foregoing additional reasons, Applicants respectfully maintain that Claim 2 is not anticipated by Osborn.

Claims 10 and 18 have similar recitations as Claim 2, and Applicants respectfully maintain that Claims 10 and 18 are patentable for the same additional reasons as Claim 2.

Claims 4, 12 and 20

Claims 4, 12 and 20 recite that a collection object is a table space. The rejection asserts that the summary table of Osborn is a table space. Applicants respectfully maintain that the summary table of Osborn is different from a table space.

A collection object has at least one table. In some embodiments, a collection object comprises indexes. In various embodiments, a collection object is a table space. Therefore a table space has at least one table, and in some embodiments, indexes. In contrast, the summary table of Osborn is a table. The summary table of Osborn is not a table space.

For the foregoing additional reasons, Applicants respectfully maintain that Claims 4, 12 and 20 are not anticipated by Osborn and are patentable.

Claims 5 and 13

Claim 5 recites that a particular collection object of the plurality of collection objects comprises a plurality of tables. Applicants respectfully maintain the summary table of Osborn is not a particular collection object of the claimed invention. The summary table of Osborn is not a collection object comprising a plurality of tables.

In addition, Osborn does not teach generating a particular statistics collection task to collect database statistics for the plurality of tables of the particular collection object. In contrast, Osborn teaches the generation of summary table creation recommendations. The summary table creation recommendations of Osborn are to create a summary table, not to collect database statistics for a plurality of tables.

For the foregoing additional reasons, Applicants respectfully maintain that Claim 5 is not anticipated by Osborn and is patentable. Claim 13 has similar recitations as Claim 5, and Applicants respectfully maintain that Claim 13 is patentable for the same reasons as Claim 5.

Conclusion

Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

January 16, 2007


Janet M. Skafar, Attorney

Reg. No. 41,315
Correspondence Customer No. 24852
Message Telephone: (408)463-5670
Facsimile: (408) 463-4827